arXiv:1703.08956v1 [cs.LO] 27 Mar 2017

Trace Expressiveness of Timed and Probabilistic Automata

Valentin Bura and Tim French and Mark Reynolds

University of Western Australia, Perth, Australia
valentin.bura@research.uwa.edu.au

Abstract. Automata expressiveness is an essential feature in understanding which of the formalisms available should be chosen for modelling a particular problem. Probabilistic and stochastic automata are suitable for modelling systems exhibiting probabilistic behaviour and their expressiveness has been studied relative to non-probabilistic transition systems and Markov chains. In this paper, we consider previous formalisms of Timed, Probabilistic and Stochastic Timed Automata, we present our new model of Timed Automata with Polynomial Delay, we introduce a measure of expressiveness for automata we call *trace expressiveness* and we characterize the expressiveness of these models relative to each other under this new measure.

Timed and probabilistic automata may be used for modelling systems that exhibit timed and probabilistic behaviour as diverse as safety-critical navigation, web security, algorithmic trading, search-engine optimization, communication protocol design and hardware failure prediction. It is important to understand the expressive power of these models and incorporate them within an expressiveness hierarchy, as properties of given machines may be deduced upwards and downwards the hierarchy. There exists, for example, a trade-off between the expressiveness of a given model of computation and the tractability/decidability of its Model Checking problem. This paper provides a unifying expressiveness framework for the aforementioned models. We also use our model of Timed Automata with Polynomial Delay, a restriction of Stochastic Timed Automata to transitions characterized by polynomials.

Lehmann and Rabin in [20] show that distributed systems of probabilistic processors are essentially more powerful than distributed systems of deterministic processors. Of interest to us, due to the concepts and machinery employed, is also *Thin and Thick Timed Regular Languages* by Basset and Asarin [2] in which information-theoretic arguments are applied for characterizing trajectories of timed automata. In [1] it is developed the theory of timed automata to model the behavior of real-time, safety-critical systems over time. The definition provides a way to include timing information within state-transition machines using real-valued variables called clocks. The paper [9] gives an introduction to probabilistic automata, describing how distributed systems with discrete probabilities can be modeled and analyzed by means of this model and extending the basic techniques of analysis of non-probabilistic automata to probabilistic

systems. Probabilistic Automata were introduced in [21] and are also treated in [22] and in [23], [24], in [11], [12] and [10].

Probabilistic timed automata are timed automata extended with discrete probability distributions, and can be used to model timed randomized protocols or fault-tolerant systems. They were introduced in [7] and are also treated in [19] and in [13]. The authors use probabilistic decision protocols to model real-time models exhibiting probabilistic behavior. Stochastic Timed Automata are treated in [3], [18], [15] and [14], [6]. These are timed automata equipped on each edge with probability distributions depending on time. A mathematical treatment of concurrent timed and probabilistic systems is given in the monograph [8]. The theory of Stochastic Processes is given in [5].

There exists the hierarchy of formal languages introduced in [17] which induces expressiveness results on certain type of automata. As expected, with a very expressive model of computation come various undecidable features. In [9] it is shown that probabilistic automata subsume non-probabilistic automata, Markov chains and Markov decision processes.

In [16] we introduced two measures of expressiveness on runs, isomorphic and homomorphic expressiveness and observed a clear separation between all formalisms considered when applying isomorphic expressiveness and a separation between stochastic and non-stochastic automata when considering homomorphic expressiveness.

In the present paper we consider traces which may roughly be equated with the "external" behaviour of a machine; we observe a similar separation between stochastic and non-stochastic models. We achieve this by assigning weights to edges of non-probabilistic machines and using the edge probabilities for the probabilistic machines and defining a notion of isomorphism between traces; this induces a measure on the traces of automata and different formalisms can then be compared subject to their collection of traces being isomorphic. We proceed by explaining the notation used and introduce finite-state automata, we introduce adapted versions of timed automata, probabilistic automata, probabilistic timed automata and stochastic timed automata and our model of timed automata with polynomial delay. In the third section we outline our expressiveness results from [16]. The fourth section introduces new results concerning trace expressiveness.

1 Preliminaries

Let $\mathbb{N}, \mathbb{Q}, \mathbb{R}$ denote the natural, rational, real numbers with instances

$$\mathtt{n}_1, \mathtt{n}_2, \ldots, \mathtt{q}_1, \mathtt{q}_2, \ldots, \mathtt{x}_1, \mathtt{x}_2, \ldots$$

Special kinds of natural numbers are members of *index sets* $\mathtt{J}$ denoted by $\mathtt{k}, \mathtt{t}, \mathtt{i}, \mathtt{j}, \mathtt{m}, \mathtt{n}, \mathtt{r}$. In the present work, index sets are always subsets of $\mathbb{N}$. For a function $\mathtt{f}$ let $\mathtt{dom}(\mathtt{f})$ denote its domain and $\mathtt{cod}(\mathtt{f})$ its codomain. A *relabelling* is any bijective map φ. An *embedding* is any non-injective map φ. Sequences may be finite or countably infinite. A $\mathtt{k}$-tuple is a sequence of length $\mathtt{k}$. For a $\mathtt{k}$-tuple

$\sigma = (s_1, s_2 \dots s_{\mathtt{k}})$ let $\sigma(\mathtt{i}) = s_{\mathtt{i}}$. For any sequence σ, let $\sigma_{\lfloor \mathtt{k}}$ be its initial segment of length $\mathtt{k}$, if $|\sigma| \leq \mathtt{k}$, or $|\sigma|$ otherwise. For any sequences σ, σ' write $\sigma \preceq \sigma'$ if σ is an initial segment of σ'. This induces a partial order on the collection of considered sequences. A collection $\mathcal{S}$ of sequences is called *prefix-free* if there exists no $\sigma, \sigma' \in \mathcal{S}$ such that $\sigma \preceq \sigma'$. For any sequence $\sigma_{\lfloor \mathtt{k}}$ let $\mathtt{head}(\sigma) = \sigma(1)$ and $\mathtt{tail}(\sigma) = \sigma(2) \dots \sigma(\mathtt{k})$

For any sequence $\sigma_1, \sigma_2 \dots \sigma_{\mathtt{k}}, \sigma_{\mathtt{k}+1} \dots$ we let $\#, \sigma_2 \dots \#, \sigma_{\mathtt{k}+1} \dots$ and $\sigma_1, \# \dots \sigma_{\mathtt{k}}, \# \dots$ denote the sub-sequences $\sigma_{2\mathtt{k}}$ and $\sigma_{2\mathtt{k}+1}$. The padding characters indicate we obtain the information in the sub-sequences by *hiding* certain components of the initial sequence. For any finite set of positive integers $\mathcal{S}$ let $\mu\mathcal{S}$ and $\xi\mathcal{S}$ denote its minimum and maximum elements respectively. A time sequence τ is a rational-valued positive sequence $\tau_{\mathtt{i}}$, the "time values", that is monotonically increasing and non-convergent. A time-isomorphism is a bijective map $\varepsilon \colon \tau \to \tau'$ such that $\tau_{\mathtt{i}} \preceq \tau_{\mathtt{j}}$ iff $\varepsilon(\tau_{\mathtt{i}}) \preceq \varepsilon(\tau_{\mathtt{j}})$ For the present purposes we extend the automata considered with a collection Γ of "actions" γ, which are finite concatenations of symbols, used to distinguish or identify edges. A *timed word* in this context is a pair of sequences $\mathtt{w} = (\gamma, \tau)$, it can be viewed as an input stream that shows action $\gamma_{\mathtt{i}}$ at time $\tau_{\mathtt{i}}$. *Clocks* are variables over $\mathbb{R}_+$ gathered in collection $\mathtt{C}$. We distinguish between clocks $\mathtt{c}_1, \mathtt{c}_2 \dots \mathtt{c}_{\mathtt{m}}$ and their real values $\mathtt{x}_1, \mathtt{x}_2 \dots \mathtt{x}_{\mathtt{m}}$ as follows. A *clock interpretation* is a function $\iota \colon \mathtt{C}^{\mathtt{m}} \to \mathbb{R}_+^{\mathtt{m}}$. Whenever it is clear from context we write $\iota(\mathtt{c}_{\mathtt{r}})$ to denote the value $\iota(\bar{\mathtt{c}})(\mathtt{r})$. The collection of all clock interpretations is denoted by $\mathbb{R}_+^{\mathtt{C}}$. The collection $\mathtt{CON}$ of *clock constraints* $\mathtt{con}$ is defined as follows:

$$\mathtt{x} < \mathtt{c} \mid \mathtt{x} \leq \mathtt{c} \mid \mathtt{c} < \mathtt{x} \mid \mathtt{c} \leq \mathtt{x} \mid \mathtt{x} \leq \mathtt{x}' + \mathtt{c} \mid \mathtt{x} < \mathtt{x}' + \mathtt{c} \mid \neg \mathtt{con} \mid \mathtt{con} \vee \mathtt{con}'$$

where $\mathtt{x}, \mathtt{x}' \in \mathbb{R}$, $\mathtt{c}_1, \mathtt{c}_2 \in \mathtt{C}$ and $\mathtt{con}, \mathtt{con}'$ are clock constraints. Constraints will be assigned to transitions between states of machines endowed with clocks, in which case we write $\mathtt{con} \in \mathtt{CON}(\mathtt{s}, \mathtt{s}')$ to denote that a transition between $\mathtt{s}$ and $\mathtt{s}'$ is associated with constraint $\mathtt{con}$. The clock interpretation ι *satisfies* the constraint $\mathtt{con}$, denoted as $\iota \rhd \mathtt{con}$ if and only if $\mathtt{con}$ resolves to a true inequality after substituting uniformly each clock variable $\mathtt{c}$ in $\mathtt{con}$ with the corresponding $\iota(\mathtt{c})$ from $\mathbb{R}_+^{\mathtt{C}}$.

Finite State Machines (automata) are models of computation based on a state/transition paradigm. We will sharply distinguish between "internal" and "external" changes in configuration of automata, corresponding to *runs* and respectively *traces*. For the automata considered we will define the form of runs ψ, traces ϕ and transitions $\mathtt{e}$ and in general we will write $\mathtt{source}(\mathtt{e})$ and $\mathtt{target}(\mathtt{e})$ to denote the state of origin and the state of destination of a given transition, denote by $\mathtt{E}$ the collection of edges of a given machine and for any run ψ we let $\psi(\mathtt{i})$ denote the $\mathtt{i}$th edge in ψ.

In the following we let $(\mathtt{S}, \mathtt{s}_1, \Gamma)$ be the State/Action triple, consisting of

- a finite set of states $\mathtt{S} = \{1, 2, \dots \mathtt{k}\}$,
- a distinguished state $\mathtt{s}_1 \in \mathtt{S}$, the *start state* and
- a collection of actions Γ

Definition 1 (Non-determinstic Finite-state Automata). *An* automaton $\mathtt{N}$ *is a quadruple* $(\mathtt{S}, \mathtt{s}_1, \Gamma, \delta)$ *where:*

$(\mathtt{S}, \mathtt{s}_1, \Gamma)$ *is the state/action triple, and*
$\delta \subset \mathtt{S} \times \Gamma \times \mathtt{S}$ *is a transition relation*

A run ψ of an NFA $\mathtt{N} = (\mathtt{S}, \mathtt{s}_1, \Gamma, \delta)$ together with its corresponding trace ϕ are sequences of the form:

$$\psi = (\mathtt{s}_1) \xrightarrow{\gamma_1} (\mathtt{s}_2) \xrightarrow{\gamma_2} \dots \text{ and } \phi = (\#) \xrightarrow{\gamma_1} (\#) \xrightarrow{\gamma_2} \dots$$

where $(\mathtt{s}_\mathtt{i}, \gamma_\mathtt{i}, \mathtt{s}_{\mathtt{i}+1}) \in \delta$ and let

$$\mathtt{e}_\psi(\mathtt{j}) = (\mathtt{s}_\mathtt{j}) \xrightarrow{\gamma_\mathtt{j}} (\mathtt{s}_{\mathtt{j}+1})$$

Let $\Psi_\mathtt{N}$ and $\Phi_\mathtt{N}$ be the collections of runs and traces of a given NFA $\mathtt{N}$. Denote by $\mathtt{NFA}$ the collection of such machines.

2 Timed and Probabilistic Automata

Timed Automata are extensions of finite automata that incorporate timing information, allowing for modelling of systems whose behaviour depends on time.

Definition 2 (Timed Automata). *A* timed automaton $\mathtt{T}$ *is a quintuple* $(\mathtt{S}, \mathtt{s}_1, \Gamma, \mathtt{C}, \delta)$ *where:*

$(\mathtt{S}, \mathtt{s}_1, \Gamma)$ *is the state/action triple, and*
$\mathtt{C} = \{\mathtt{c}_1, \mathtt{c}_2, \dots \mathtt{c}_\mathtt{m}\}$ *is a finite collection of variables called* clocks*,*
$\delta \subset \mathtt{S} \times 2^\mathtt{C} \times \mathtt{CON} \times \Gamma \times \mathtt{S}$ *is the* transition relation*.*

A *run* ψ associated with a timed automaton $\mathtt{T} = (\mathtt{S}, \mathtt{s}_1, \Gamma, \mathtt{C}, \delta)$ over a timed word $\mathtt{w} = (\gamma, \tau)$ with $\gamma \in \Gamma$ together with the corresponding *trace* ϕ are sequences of the form

$$\psi = (\mathtt{s}_1, \iota_1, \mathtt{R}_1) \xrightarrow[\tau_1]{\gamma_1} (\mathtt{s}_2, \iota_2, \mathtt{R}_2) \xrightarrow[\tau_2]{\gamma_2} \dots \text{ and } \phi = (\#, \#, \#) \xrightarrow[\tau_1]{\gamma_1} (\#, \#, \#) \xrightarrow[\tau_2]{\gamma_2} \dots$$

where each $\mathtt{s}_\mathtt{i}$ is a state, $\iota_\mathtt{i}$ is a *clock interpretation* and the transition happens "within time $\tau_\mathtt{i}$", such that $\mathtt{s}_1$ is the start state and $\iota_1(\mathtt{c}) = 0$ and $\mathtt{R}_1 = \emptyset$ for all clocks $\mathtt{c}$, and for all i there is an edge specified by δ from $\mathtt{s}_\mathtt{i}$ to $\mathtt{s}_{i+1}$ such that $\iota_\mathtt{k} \rhd \mathtt{con}$ where $\mathtt{con} \in \mathtt{CON}(\mathtt{s}_\mathtt{k}, \mathtt{s}_{\mathtt{k}+1})$. Let $\psi(\mathtt{j}) = (\mathtt{s}_\mathtt{j}, \iota_\mathtt{j})$, let $\psi_{\lfloor \mathtt{k}}$ be the initial segment of ψ that ends with $(\mathtt{s}_{\mathtt{k}+1}, \iota_{\mathtt{k}+1})$ and let

$$\mathtt{e}_\psi(\mathtt{j}) = (\mathtt{s}_\mathtt{j}, \iota_\mathtt{j}, \mathtt{R}_\mathtt{j}) \xrightarrow[\tau_\mathtt{j}]{\gamma_\mathtt{j}} (\mathtt{s}_{\mathtt{j}+1}, \iota_{\mathtt{j}+1}, \mathtt{R}_{\mathtt{j}+1})$$

Note that one obtains ϕ from ψ by replacing all the pairs $(\mathtt{s}, \iota)$ with padding characters. For any run ψ we let $\mathtt{S}(\psi)$, $\Gamma(\psi)$, $\mathtt{T}(\psi)$ denote the sequences of states, actions and time instances in ψ, for any trace ϕ we let $\Gamma(\phi)$ and $\mathtt{T}(\phi)$ denote the sequences of actions and time instances in ϕ. Let $\Psi_\mathtt{T}$ and $\Phi_\mathtt{T}$ denote the

collection of all runs and traces of a given T. Denote by $\mathtt{TIMED}$ the collection of timed automata.

Probabilistic Timed Automata are summarized by Stoelinga in [9] and use discrete probabilistic choice and non-deterministic choice which makes it suitable for modelling randomized distributed algorithms, probabilistic communication protocols and systems with failing components.

Definition 3 (Probabilistic Automata).
A probabilistic automaton P *is a quintuple* $(\mathtt{S}, \mathtt{s}_1, \Gamma, \mathtt{distr}, \delta)$ *where:*

$(\mathtt{S}, \mathtt{s}_1, \Gamma)$ *is the state/action triple, and*
$\mathtt{distr}$ *is a discrete probability distribution assigned to pairs of states,*
$\delta \subseteq \mathtt{S} \times \mathtt{S} \times \mathtt{distr}(\mathtt{S} \times \mathtt{S}) \times \Gamma$ *is the probabilistic transition relation with* $\mathtt{distr}(\mathtt{s}, \mathtt{s}') \in [0,1] \cap \mathbb{Q}$ *for any* $\mathtt{s}, \mathtt{s}' \in \mathtt{S}$.

A *run* ψ of a probabilistic automaton P is a sequence of states and edge probabilities while the corresponding *trace* ϕ is a sequence of actions

$$\psi = (\mathtt{s}_1, \mathtt{distr}(\mathtt{s}_1, \mathtt{s}_2)) \xrightarrow{\gamma_1} (\mathtt{s}_2, \mathtt{distr}(\mathtt{s}_2, \mathtt{s}_3)) \xrightarrow{\gamma_2} \ldots, \; \phi = (\#, \#) \xrightarrow{\gamma_1} (\#, \#) \xrightarrow{\gamma_2} \ldots$$

such that $\mathtt{distr}(\mathtt{s}_\mathtt{k}, \mathtt{s}_{\mathtt{k}+1}) > 0$ for all $\mathtt{k}$. Let $\psi(\mathtt{j}) = (\mathtt{s}_\mathtt{j}, \mathtt{distr}(\mathtt{s}_\mathtt{j}, \mathtt{s}_{\mathtt{j}+1}))$, let $\psi_{\lfloor \mathtt{k}}$ be the initial segment of ψ that ends with $(\mathtt{s}_{\mathtt{k}+1}, \mathtt{distr}(\mathtt{s}_{\mathtt{k}+1}, \mathtt{s}_{\mathtt{k}+2}))$ and let

$$\mathtt{e}_\psi(\mathtt{j}) = (\mathtt{s}_\mathtt{j}, \mathtt{distr}(\mathtt{s}_\mathtt{j}, \mathtt{s}_{\mathtt{j}+1})) \xrightarrow[\tau_\mathtt{j}]{\gamma_\mathtt{j}} (\mathtt{s}_{\mathtt{j}+1}, \mathtt{distr}(\mathtt{s}_{\mathtt{j}+1}, \mathtt{s}_{\mathtt{j}+2}))$$

Denote by Ψ_P the collection of runs and by Φ_P the collection of traces of a given machine P. Denote by $\mathtt{PROB}$ the collection of extended probabilistic automata.

Kwiatkowska et al. define probabilistic timed automata in [7] building on discrete-time Markov chains.

Definition 4 (Probabilistic Timed Automata). *A* probabilistic timed automaton A *is a pentuple* $(\mathtt{S}, \mathtt{s}_1, \Gamma, \mathtt{C}, \mathtt{prob})$ *where*

$(\mathtt{S}, \mathtt{s}_1, \Gamma)$ *is the state/action triple, and*
$\mathtt{C} = \{\mathtt{c}_1, \mathtt{c}_2, \ldots \mathtt{c}_\mathtt{m}\}$ *is a finite collection of* clocks,
$\mathtt{prob} \subseteq \mathtt{S} \times \mathtt{S} \times \mathtt{distr}(\mathtt{S} \times \mathtt{S}) \times \Gamma \times \mathtt{CON} \times \mathtt{R}$ *is the probabilistic transition relation with* $\mathtt{distr}(\mathtt{s}, \mathtt{s}') \in [0,1] \cap \mathbb{Q}$ *for any* $\mathtt{s}, \mathtt{s}' \in \mathtt{S}$.

A *run* ψ of a probabilistic timed automaton A and the corresponding *trace* ϕ are sequences of the form

$$\psi = (\mathtt{s}_1, \mathtt{distr}(\mathtt{s}_1, \mathtt{s}_2), \iota_1, \mathtt{R}_1) \xrightarrow[\tau_1]{\gamma_1} (\mathtt{s}_2, \mathtt{distr}(\mathtt{s}_2, \mathtt{s}_3), \iota_2, \mathtt{R}_2) \xrightarrow[\tau_2]{\gamma_2} \ldots \text{ and}$$
$$\phi = (\#, \#, \#, \#) \xrightarrow[\tau_1]{\gamma_1} (\#, \#, \#, \#) \xrightarrow[\tau_2]{\gamma_2} \ldots$$

such that $\mathtt{distr}(\mathtt{s}_\mathtt{k}, \mathtt{s}_{\mathtt{k}+1}) > 0$ for all $\mathtt{k}$, $\iota_1(\mathtt{c}) = 0$, $\mathtt{R}_1 = \emptyset$ and $\iota_\mathtt{k} \rhd \mathtt{con}$ where $\mathtt{CON}(\mathtt{s}_\mathtt{k}, \mathtt{s}_{\mathtt{k}+1}) = \mathtt{con}$. Let $\psi(\mathtt{j}) = (\mathtt{s}_\mathtt{j}, \mathtt{distr}(\mathtt{s}_\mathtt{j}, \mathtt{s}_{\mathtt{j}+1}), \iota_\mathtt{j}, \mathtt{R}_\mathtt{j})$, let $\psi_{\lfloor \mathtt{k}}$ be the initial segment of ψ that ends with $(\mathtt{s}_\mathtt{k}, \mathtt{distr}(\mathtt{s}_\mathtt{k}, \mathtt{s}_{\mathtt{k}+1}), \iota_\mathtt{k}, \mathtt{R}_\mathtt{k})$ and let

$$\mathtt{e}_\psi(\mathtt{j}) = (\mathtt{s}_\mathtt{j}, \mathtt{distr}(\mathtt{s}_\mathtt{j}, \mathtt{s}_{\mathtt{j}+1}), \iota_\mathtt{j}, \mathtt{R}_\mathtt{j}) \xrightarrow[\tau_\mathtt{j}]{\gamma_\mathtt{j}} (\mathtt{s}_{\mathtt{j}+1}, \mathtt{distr}(\mathtt{s}_{\mathtt{j}+1}, \mathtt{s}_{\mathtt{j}+2}), \iota_{\mathtt{j}+1}, \mathtt{R}_{\mathtt{j}+1})$$

Denote by Ψ_A the collection of runs and Φ_A the collection of traces of a given A. Denote by $\mathtt{PROBTIMED}$ the collection of extended probabilistic timed automata.

Definition 5 (Stochastic Timed Automata). *A* stochastic timed automaton $\mathtt{S}$ *is a sixtuple* $(\mathtt{S}, \mathtt{s}_1, \Gamma, \mathtt{C}, \mathtt{F}, \Delta)$ *where:*

$(\mathtt{S}, \mathtt{s}_1, \Gamma)$ *is the state/action triple, and*
$\mathtt{C}$ *is a finite collection of variables* $\mathtt{c}_1, \mathtt{c}_2 \cdots \mathtt{c}_\mathtt{m}$ *called* clocks *such that for each triple* $(\mathtt{i}, \mathtt{j}, \mathtt{r}) \in \mathtt{S} \times \mathtt{S} \times \{1 \ldots \mathtt{m}\}$ *we have* $\mathtt{dom}^{\mathtt{i}}_{\mathtt{j}}(\mathtt{c}_\mathtt{r}) = (\mathtt{q}_1, \mathtt{q}_2)$ *for* $0 \leq \mathtt{q}_1 < \mathtt{q}_2 \leq 1$,
$\mathtt{F}$ *is a finite family of integrable functions of* $\mathtt{m}$ *variables* $\mathtt{f}^1_1, \mathtt{f}^1_2 \ldots \mathtt{f}^\mathtt{k}_\mathtt{k}$ *with*

$$\mathtt{dom}(\mathtt{f}^{\mathtt{i}}_{\mathtt{j}}) = \prod_{\mathtt{r}=1}^{\mathtt{m}} \mathtt{dom}(\mathtt{c}_\mathtt{r})$$

Δ *is a finite family of functions* $\delta^1_1, \delta^1_2 \ldots \delta^\mathtt{k}_\mathtt{k}$ *such that* $\delta^{\mathtt{i}}_{\mathtt{j}} \colon [0,1]^{\mathtt{m}} \to [0,1) \times \Gamma$, *such that*

$$\mathtt{dom}(\delta^{\mathtt{i}}_{\mathtt{j}}) = \mathtt{dom}(\mathtt{f}^{\mathtt{i}}_{\mathtt{j}}) \text{ and } \mathtt{cod}(\delta^{\mathtt{i}}_{\mathtt{j}}) = \mathtt{P}^{\mathtt{i}}_{\mathtt{j}}$$

with each $\mathtt{P}^{\mathtt{i}}_{\mathtt{j}}$ *specifying the probability of moving from state* $\mathtt{s}_\mathtt{i}$ *to state* $\mathtt{s}_\mathtt{j}$ *by*

$$\mathtt{P}^{\mathtt{i}}_{\mathtt{j}} = \frac{|\mathtt{f}^{\mathtt{i}}_{\mathtt{j}}|}{\sum_{\mathtt{k}=1}^{\mathtt{m}} |\mathtt{f}^{\mathtt{i}}_{\mathtt{k}}|} \in [0,1)$$

A *run* of a stochastic timed automaton $\mathtt{S}$ together with the corresponding *trace* are the sequences

$$\psi = (\mathtt{s}_1, \mathtt{f}^1_2, \iota_1) \xrightarrow[\tau_1]{\gamma_1} (\mathtt{s}_2, \mathtt{f}^2_3, \iota_2) \xrightarrow[\tau_2]{\gamma_2} \ldots \text{ and } \phi = (\#, \#, \#) \xrightarrow[\tau_1]{\gamma_1} (\#, \#, \#) \xrightarrow[\tau_2]{\gamma_2} \ldots$$

such that $\mu(\mathtt{s}_\mathtt{k}, \iota) > 0$ for all $\mathtt{k}$, $\iota_1(\mathtt{c}) = 0$, with $\iota_\mathtt{k} \in \mathtt{dom}(\mathtt{f}^\mathtt{k}_{\mathtt{k}+1})$. Let $\psi(\mathtt{j}) = (\mathtt{s}_\mathtt{j}, \mathtt{f}^\mathtt{j}_{\mathtt{j}+1}, \iota_\mathtt{j}, \mathtt{R}_\mathtt{j})$, let $\psi_{\lfloor \mathtt{k}}$ be the initial segment of ψ that ends with $(\mathtt{s}_\mathtt{k}, \mathtt{f}^\mathtt{k}_{\mathtt{k}+1}, \iota_\mathtt{k}, \mathtt{R}_\mathtt{k})$ and let

$$\mathtt{e}_\psi(\mathtt{j}) = (\mathtt{s}_\mathtt{j}, \mathtt{f}^\mathtt{j}_{\mathtt{j}+1}, \iota_\mathtt{j}) \xrightarrow[\tau_\mathtt{j}]{\gamma_\mathtt{j}} (\mathtt{s}_{\mathtt{j}+1}, \mathtt{f}^{\mathtt{j}+1}_{\mathtt{j}+2}, \iota_{\mathtt{j}+1})$$

Denote by $\Psi_\mathtt{S}$ the collection of runs and $\Phi_\mathtt{S}$ the collection of traces of a given $\mathtt{S}$. Denote by `STOCTIMED` the collection of Stochastic Timed Automata.

For any function $\mathtt{f}$ of $\mathtt{n}$ variables, let its Taylor polynomial of degree Π be ${}_\Pi\mathcal{T}(\mathtt{f}(\mathtt{x}_1, \cdots, \mathtt{x}_\mathtt{n}))$. Timed Automata with Polynomial Delay are a restriction of Stochastic Timed Automata to transitions described by functions expressible by Taylor polynomials only. The motivation for introducing this model is to allow a digital representation for the functions determining the machine transitions.

Definition 6 (Timed Automata with Polynomial Delay).
A timed automaton with polynomial delay $\mathtt{D}$ *is a septuple* $(\mathtt{S}, \mathtt{s}_1, \Gamma, \mathtt{C}, \mathtt{F}, \Delta, \Pi)$ *where:*

$(\mathtt{S}, \mathtt{s}_1, \Gamma)$ *is the state/action triple, and*
$\mathtt{C}$ *is a finite collection of variables* $\mathtt{c}_1, \mathtt{c}_2 \cdots \mathtt{c}_\mathtt{m}$ *called* clocks *such that for each triple* $(\mathtt{i}, \mathtt{j}, \mathtt{r}) \in \mathtt{S} \times \mathtt{S} \times \{1 \ldots \mathtt{m}\}$ *we have* $\mathtt{dom}^{\mathtt{i}}_{\mathtt{j}}(\mathtt{c}_\mathtt{r}) = (\mathtt{q}_1, \mathtt{q}_2)$ *for* $0 \leq \mathtt{q}_1 < \mathtt{q}_2 \leq 1$,

$\mathtt{F}$ *is a finite family of differentiable functions of* $\mathtt{m}$ *variables* $\mathtt{f}^1_1, \mathtt{f}^1_2 \ldots \mathtt{f}^{\mathtt{k}}_{\mathtt{k}}$ *with*

$$\mathtt{dom}(\mathtt{f}^{\mathtt{i}}_{\mathtt{j}}) = \prod_{\mathtt{r}=1}^{\mathtt{m}} \mathtt{dom}(\mathtt{c}_{\mathtt{r}})$$

Δ *is a finite family of functions* $\delta^1_1, \delta^1_2 \ldots \delta^m_m$ *such that* $\delta^{\mathtt{i}}_{\mathtt{j}} \colon [0,1]^{\mathtt{m}} \to [0,1) \times \Gamma$, *such that*

$$\mathtt{dom}(\delta^{\mathtt{i}}_{\mathtt{j}}) = \mathtt{dom}(\mathtt{f}^{\mathtt{i}}_{\mathtt{j}}) \text{ and } \mathtt{cod}(\delta^{\mathtt{i}}_{\mathtt{j}}) = \mathtt{P}^{\mathtt{i}}_{\mathtt{j}}$$

with each $\mathtt{P}^{\mathtt{i}}_{\mathtt{j}}$ *specifying the probability of moving from state* $\mathtt{s}_{\mathtt{i}}$ *to state* $\mathtt{s}_{\mathtt{j}}$ *by*

$$\mathtt{P}^{\mathtt{i}}_{\mathtt{j}} = \frac{|{}_{\Pi}\mathcal{T}^{\mathtt{i}}_{\mathtt{j}}|}{\sum_{\mathtt{k}=1}^{\mathtt{m}} |{}_{\Pi}\mathcal{T}^{\mathtt{i}}_{\mathtt{k}}|} \in [0,1)$$

where ${}_{\Pi}\mathcal{T}^{\mathtt{i}}_{\mathtt{j}}$ *is the Taylor polynomial of* $\mathtt{f}^{\mathtt{i}}_{\mathtt{j}}$ *of degree* Π

A *run* ψ associated with a timed automaton with polynomial delay D together with the corresponding *trace* ϕ are sequences of the form

$$\psi = (\mathtt{s}_1, \delta^1_2, \iota_1) \xrightarrow[\tau_1]{\gamma_1} (\mathtt{s}_2, \delta^2_3, \iota_2) \xrightarrow[\tau_2]{\gamma_2} \ldots \text{ and } \phi = (\#, \#, \#) \xrightarrow[\tau_1]{\gamma_1} (\#, \#, \#) \xrightarrow[\tau_2]{\gamma_2} \ldots$$

where each $\mathtt{s}_{\mathtt{i}}$ is a state, $\iota_{\mathtt{i}}$ is a *clock interpretation*, $\iota_1(\mathtt{c}) = 0$, and the transition happens "within time $\tau_{\mathtt{i}}$" and for all $\mathtt{i}$ there is an edge $\delta^{\mathtt{i}}_{\mathtt{i}+1} \in \Delta$ with $\iota_{\mathtt{i}+1} \in \mathtt{dom}(\delta^{\mathtt{i}}_{\mathtt{i}+1})$ and $\mathtt{P}^{\mathtt{i}}_{\mathtt{i}+1}(\iota_{\mathtt{i}}) > 0$.

Let $\psi(\mathtt{j}) = (\mathtt{s}_{\mathtt{j}}, \delta^{\mathtt{j}}_{\mathtt{j}+1}, \iota_{\mathtt{j}})$, let $\psi_{\lfloor \mathtt{k}}$ be the initial segment of ψ that ends with $(\mathtt{s}_{\mathtt{k}}, \delta^{\mathtt{k}}_{\mathtt{k}+1}, \iota_{\mathtt{k}})$ and let $\mathtt{e}_{\psi}(\mathtt{j}) = (\mathtt{s}_{\mathtt{j}}, \delta^{\mathtt{j}}_{\mathtt{j}+1}, \iota_{\mathtt{j}}) \xrightarrow[\tau_{\mathtt{j}}]{\gamma_{\mathtt{j}}} (\mathtt{s}_{\mathtt{j}+1}, \delta^{\mathtt{j}+1}_{\mathtt{j}+2}, \iota_{\mathtt{j}+1})$. Denote by Ψ_{D} the collection of runs of a given timed automaton with polynomial delay D. Note again that one obtains ϕ from ψ by replacing all the pairs $(\mathtt{s}, \iota)$ with padding characters. Let Φ_{D} denote the collection of traces of a given D and let Ψ_{D} denote the collection of runs of a given D. Denote by $\mathtt{DELAY}$ the collection of timed automata with polynomial delay.

3 Isomorphic Expressiveness

One obtains a measure on the runs of non-probabilistic automata from a weighting map $\mathtt{W} \colon \mathtt{E} \to [0,1] \cap \mathbb{Q}$ assigning weights $\mathtt{w}(\mathtt{e})$ to edges s.t. $\sum_{\forall \mathtt{j} \forall \psi} \mathtt{w}(\mathtt{e}_{\psi}(\mathtt{j})) = 1$ and defining $\mathcal{H}(\mathtt{e}) = \mathtt{w}(\mathtt{e})$ and $\mathcal{H}(\mathtt{e}, \mathtt{e}') = \mathtt{w}(\mathtt{e}) \times \mathtt{w}(\mathtt{e}')$ and
$\mathcal{H}(\psi_{\lfloor \mathtt{k}}) = \mathcal{H}(\mathtt{head}(\psi_{\lfloor \mathtt{k}})) \times \mathcal{H}(\mathtt{tail}(\psi_{\lfloor \mathtt{k}}))$

We assign $\mathtt{w}(\mathtt{e})$ to transitions of the form $(\mathtt{s}) \xrightarrow[\tau]{\gamma} (\mathtt{s}')$ under the constraints $\sum_{\forall \mathtt{j} \forall \psi} \mathtt{w}(\mathtt{e}_{\psi}(\mathtt{j})) = 1$ and for all s', s'' such that there exists edges $\mathtt{e} = (\mathtt{s}) \xrightarrow[\tau]{\gamma} (\mathtt{s}')$ and $\mathtt{e}' = (\mathtt{s}) \xrightarrow[\tau]{\gamma} (\mathtt{s}'')$ we let $\mathtt{w}(\mathtt{e}) = \mathtt{w}(\mathtt{e}')$. Define $\mathcal{H}(\mathtt{e}) = \mathtt{w}(\mathtt{e})$, $\mathcal{H}(\mathtt{e}, \mathtt{e}') = \mathtt{w}(\mathtt{e}) \times \mathtt{w}(\mathtt{e}')$ and for any finite run ψ define $\mathcal{H}(\psi) = \mathcal{H}(\mathtt{head}(\psi)) \times \mathcal{H}(\mathtt{tail}(\psi))$

The definition of a measure on the run of a Timed Automaton is essentially the same. We assign $\mathtt{w}(\mathtt{e})$ to transitions of the form $\mathtt{e} = (\mathtt{s}, \iota, \mathtt{R}) \overset{\gamma}{\underset{\tau}{\to}} (\mathtt{s}', \iota', \mathtt{R}')$ under the constraints $\sum_{\forall \mathtt{j} \forall \psi} \mathtt{w}(\mathtt{e}_\psi(\mathtt{j})) = 1$ and for all s', s'' such that there exists edges $\mathtt{e} = (\mathtt{s}, \iota, \mathtt{R}) \overset{\gamma}{\underset{\tau}{\to}} (\mathtt{s}', \iota', \mathtt{R}')$ and $\mathtt{e}' = (\mathtt{s}, \iota, \mathtt{R}) \overset{\gamma}{\underset{\tau}{\to}} (\mathtt{s}'', \iota'', \mathtt{R}'')$ we let $\mathtt{w}(\mathtt{e}) = \mathtt{w}(\mathtt{e}')$. Define the measure of a run by $\mathcal{H}(\mathtt{e}) = \mathtt{w}(\mathtt{e})$, $\mathcal{H}(\mathtt{e}, \mathtt{e}') = \mathtt{w}(\mathtt{e}) \times \mathtt{w}(\mathtt{e}')$ and for any finite ψ define $\mathcal{H}(\psi) = \mathcal{H}(\mathtt{head}(\psi)) \times \mathcal{H}(\mathtt{tail}(\psi))$

In defining the measure on the runs of probabilistic machines we will take advantage of the probabilities assigned to edges. Hence, machines that have the same transition structure may have different measures assigned to isomorphic runs, which gives a machinery for establishing when runs are equinumerous. Let $\psi_{\lfloor \mathtt{k}}$ be a finite fragment of a run of a probabilistic automaton with

$$\psi_{\lfloor \mathtt{k}} = (\mathtt{s}_1, \mathtt{distr}(\mathtt{s}_1, \mathtt{s}_2)) \overset{\gamma_1}{\underset{\tau_1}{\to}} (\mathtt{s}_2, \mathtt{distr}(\mathtt{s}_2, \mathtt{s}_3)) \overset{\gamma_2}{\underset{\tau_2}{\to}} \dots (\mathtt{s}_\mathtt{k}, \mathtt{distr}(\mathtt{s}_\mathtt{k}, \mathtt{s}_{\mathtt{k}+1}))$$

define the measure of ψ as follows:

$$\mathcal{H}(\mathtt{e}_\psi(\mathtt{j})) = \mathtt{distr}(\mathtt{s}_\mathtt{j}, \mathtt{s}_{\mathtt{j}+1}) \text{ and}$$
$$\mathcal{H}(\mathtt{e}_\psi(\mathtt{j}), \mathtt{e}_\psi(\mathtt{j}+1)) = \mathtt{distr}(\mathtt{s}_\mathtt{j}, \mathtt{s}_{\mathtt{j}+1}) \times \mathtt{distr}(\mathtt{s}_{\mathtt{j}+1}, \mathtt{s}_{\mathtt{j}+2}) \text{ and}$$
$$\mathcal{H}(\psi_{\lfloor \mathtt{k}}) = \mathcal{H}(\mathtt{head}(\psi)) \times \mathcal{H}(\mathtt{tail}(\psi))$$

A measure on a PTA run is essentially the same. Let $\psi_{\lfloor \mathtt{k}}$ be a finite fragment of a run of a probabilistic timed automaton with

$$\psi = (\mathtt{s}_1, \mathtt{distr}(\mathtt{s}_1, \mathtt{s}_2), \iota_1, \mathtt{R}_1) \overset{\gamma_1}{\underset{\tau_1}{\to}} \dots (\mathtt{s}_\mathtt{k}, \mathtt{distr}(\mathtt{s}_\mathtt{k}, \mathtt{s}_{\mathtt{k}+1}), \iota_\mathtt{k}, \mathtt{R}_\mathtt{k})$$

define the measure of ψ as follows:

$$\mathcal{H}(\mathtt{e}_\psi(\mathtt{j})) = \mathtt{distr}(\mathtt{s}_\mathtt{j}, \mathtt{s}_{\mathtt{j}+1}) \text{ and}$$
$$\mathcal{H}(\mathtt{e}_\psi(\mathtt{j}), \mathtt{e}_\psi(\mathtt{j}+1)) = \mathtt{distr}(\mathtt{s}_\mathtt{j}, \mathtt{s}_{\mathtt{j}+1}) \times \mathtt{distr}(\mathtt{s}_{\mathtt{j}+1}, \mathtt{s}_{\mathtt{j}+2}) \text{ and}$$
$$\mathcal{H}(\psi_{\lfloor \mathtt{k}}) = \mathcal{H}(\mathtt{head}(\psi_{\lfloor \mathtt{k}})) \times \mathcal{H}(\mathtt{tail}(\psi_{\lfloor \mathtt{k}}))$$

Measures on TAPD and STA runs must take into account the function of time that determines a transition. Let ψ be a finite run of a timed automaton with polynomial delay with

$$\psi = (\mathtt{s}_1, \delta^{\mathtt{s}_1}_{\mathtt{s}_2}, \iota_1) \overset{\gamma_1}{\underset{\tau_1}{\to}} (\mathtt{s}_2, \delta^{\mathtt{s}_2}_{\mathtt{s}_3}, \iota_2) \overset{\gamma_2}{\underset{\tau_2}{\to}} \dots (\mathtt{s}_\mathtt{k}, \delta^{\mathtt{s}_\mathtt{k}}_{\mathtt{s}_{\mathtt{k}+1}}, \iota_\mathtt{k})$$

define the measure of ψ as follows: $\mathcal{H}(\psi_{\lfloor \mathtt{k}}) = \int\limits_R \prod\limits_{\mathtt{i}=1}^{\mathtt{k}} \mathtt{P}^{\mathtt{s}_\mathtt{i}}_{\mathtt{s}_{\mathtt{i}+1}}(\bar{\mathtt{c}}) d\bar{\mathtt{c}}$ where $R = \bigcup\limits_{\mathtt{i} \le \mathtt{k}} (\mathtt{dom}(\delta^{\mathtt{s}_\mathtt{i}}_{\mathtt{s}_{\mathtt{i}+1}}) \bigcap \mathtt{dom}(\delta^{\mathtt{s}_{\mathtt{i}+1}}_{\mathtt{s}_{\mathtt{i}+2}}))$

Let ψ be a finite run of a stochastic timed automaton with

$$\psi = (\mathtt{s}_1, \mathtt{f}^{\mathtt{s}_1}_{\mathtt{s}_2}, \iota_1) \overset{\gamma_1}{\underset{\tau_1}{\to}} (\mathtt{s}_2, \mathtt{f}^{\mathtt{s}_2}_{\mathtt{s}_3}, \iota_2) \overset{\gamma_2}{\underset{\tau_2}{\to}} \dots (\mathtt{s}_\mathtt{k}, \mathtt{f}^{\mathtt{s}_\mathtt{k}}_{\mathtt{s}_{\mathtt{k}+1}}, \iota_\mathtt{k})$$

define the measure of ψ as follows: $\mathcal{H}(\psi_{\lfloor \mathtt{k}}) = \int\limits_R \prod\limits_{\mathtt{i}=1}^{\mathtt{k}} \mathtt{f}^{\mathtt{s}_\mathtt{i}}_{\mathtt{s}_{\mathtt{i}+1}}(\bar{\mathtt{c}}) d\bar{\mathtt{c}}$

The following result shows our measures are well-defined and was proved in [16].

Proposition 1. *For any run ψ, the measure $\mathcal{H}$ on ψ is finite and we have $\mathcal{H}(\psi) < 1$*

Proof sketch: In the case of a NFA, TA or PA let $\mathtt{w}_1, \mathtt{w}_2 \dots \mathtt{w}_\mathtt{k}$ be the weights associated with the transitions in run ψ. Since any such $\mathtt{w}_\mathtt{i}$ is less than 1 a straightforward inductive argument shows that we have $\mathtt{w}_1 \times \mathtt{w}_2 \times \cdots \times \mathtt{w}_\mathtt{k} < 1$ since $\mathtt{w}_\mathtt{i} < 1$ for all $\mathtt{i}$. In the case of a TAPD or SA let $\mathtt{f}_1, \mathtt{f}_2 \dots \mathtt{f}_\mathtt{k}$ be the functions associated with the transitions of the run ψ. Since the domain and codomain of each function is bounded by the interval $[0, 1]$ it follows inductively that $\int_R \prod_{\mathtt{i}=1}^{\mathtt{k}} \mathtt{f}_\mathtt{i}(\bar{\mathtt{c}}) d\bar{\mathtt{c}} \leq 1$ □

We introduce the measure $\mathcal{L}$ on collections of runs. We require the collections to be prefix-free in order to avoid redundancies in representation. For any prefix-free collection of runs Ψ' of a given NFA, TA, PA, PTA, TAPD or STA, let the measure $\mathcal{L}$ on the runs of Ψ' be $\mathcal{L}(\Psi') = \sum_{\psi \in \Psi'} \mathcal{H}(\psi)$ We note that for any prefix-free collection of runs Ψ' of a fixed machine, we have $\mathcal{L}(\Psi') < 1$

Let ψ, ψ' be runs containing timing information. We consider them isomorphic and write $\psi \cong \psi'$ if there exist maps $\varphi \colon \mathtt{S}(\psi) \to \mathtt{S}(\psi')$, $\varepsilon \colon \mathtt{T}(\psi) \to \mathtt{T}(\psi')$ and $\vartheta \colon \Gamma(\psi) \to \Gamma(\psi')$ such that, for all $\mathtt{k}$, φ is a relabelling, ε is a time-isomorphism, ϑ is a relabelling and for all $\mathtt{i} \leq \mathtt{k}$ $\varphi(\mathtt{S}(\psi(\mathtt{i}))) = \varphi(\mathtt{S}(\psi'(\mathtt{i})))$ and $\varepsilon(\mathtt{T}(\psi(\mathtt{i}))) = \varepsilon(\mathtt{T}(\mathtt{S}(\psi'(\mathtt{i}))))$ and $\vartheta(\Gamma(\psi(\mathtt{i}))) = \vartheta(\Gamma(\mathtt{S}(\psi'(\mathtt{i}))))$ with $\mathcal{H}(\psi) = \mathcal{H}(\psi')$. Alternatively, if one of ψ, ψ' does not contain timing information, we will only require the relabelling on states and the relabelling on actions: $\varphi \colon \mathtt{S}(\psi) \to \mathtt{S}(\psi')$ and $\vartheta \colon \Gamma(\psi) \to \Gamma(\psi')$ such that, for all $\mathtt{k}$, φ is a relabelling, ϑ is a relabelling and for all $\mathtt{i} \leq \mathtt{k}$

$$\varphi(\mathtt{S}(\psi(\mathtt{i}))) = \varphi(\mathtt{S}(\psi'(\mathtt{i}))) \text{ and } \vartheta(\Gamma(\psi(\mathtt{i}))) = \vartheta(\Gamma(\mathtt{S}(\psi'(\mathtt{i})))) \text{ with } \mathcal{H}(\psi) = \mathcal{H}(\psi')$$

Isomorphic expressiveness is then a relation between machines with isomorphic runs. For two collections of runs Ψ and Ψ', let them be expressively isomorphic, $\Psi \cong \Psi'$, if there exists a bijection $\alpha \colon \Psi \to \Psi'$, relabellings φ, ϑ and a time-isomorphism ε such that $\psi \cong \alpha(\psi)$ with $\mathtt{S}(\psi) \xrightarrow{\varphi} \mathtt{S}(\alpha(\psi))$, $\mathtt{T}(\psi) \xrightarrow{\varepsilon} \mathtt{T}(\alpha(\psi))$ and $\Gamma(\psi) \xrightarrow{\vartheta} \Gamma(\alpha(\psi))$, or if one of Ψ, Ψ' does not contain runs with timing information, $\psi \cong \alpha(\psi)$ with $\mathtt{S}(\psi) \xrightarrow{\varphi} \mathtt{S}(\alpha(\psi))$, and $\Gamma(\psi) \xrightarrow{\vartheta} \Gamma(\alpha(\psi))$ as in Figure 3. We require these maps to be fixed for all runs. We say machine M expresses machine M' and write $M \cong M'$ if $\Psi_M \cong \Psi_{M'}$ and for every $\hat{\Psi} \subset \Psi_M$, $\hat{\Psi}' \subset \Psi_{M'}$ if $\hat{\Psi} \cong \hat{\Psi}'$ then $\mathcal{L}(\hat{\Psi}) = \mathcal{L}(\hat{\Psi}')$. A collection of machines $\mathcal{S}$ *expresses* a collection of machines $\mathcal{S}'$ and write $\mathcal{S}' \sqsubseteq_{\mathtt{iso}} \mathcal{S}$ if for every $M' \in \mathcal{S}'$ there exists $M \in \mathcal{S}$ such that $M \cong M'$. Write $\mathcal{S}' \sqsubset_{\mathtt{iso}} \mathcal{S}$ if the inclusion is strict.

Applying isomorphic expressiveness to each type of machine considered in this paper yields the result showed previously in [16], observing the following strict inclusions depicted in Fig 1

- $\mathtt{NFA} \sqsubset_{\mathtt{iso}} \mathtt{TIMED}$,
- $\mathtt{NFA} \sqsubset_{\mathtt{iso}} \mathtt{PROB}$,
- $\mathtt{TIMED} \sqsubset_{\mathtt{iso}} \mathtt{PROBTIMED}$,

- $\texttt{PROB} \sqsubset_{\texttt{iso}} \texttt{PROBTIMED}$,
- $\texttt{PROBTIMED} \sqsubset_{\texttt{iso}} \texttt{DELAY}$,
- $\texttt{DELAY} \sqsubset_{\texttt{iso}} \texttt{STOCTIMED}$



Fig. 1. Isomorphic Expressiveness

4 Trace Expressiveness

We will now introduce a weaker measure of automata expressiveness that applies to traces rather than runs. We have a made a sharp distinction between the *internal* and *external* behaviour of automata, corresponding to runs and traces respectively. This new measure of expressiveness applies therefore to the external, "observable" behaviour of automata.

We assign weights $\texttt{w}$ to elements of a collection of actions Γ through a weighting map $\texttt{W}\colon \Gamma \to [0,1]$. For non-probabilistic machines we let $\sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma} \gamma = 1$ For probabilistic automata we let $\texttt{w}(\gamma) = \mu\{\texttt{distr}(\texttt{s}, \texttt{s}')\}$ if $\gamma \in (\texttt{s}, \texttt{s}')$ For a sequence of actions $\gamma = \gamma_{\texttt{i}}$ such that $\gamma = \Gamma(\phi)$ for a given trace ϕ, let $\mathcal{H}(\gamma_1) = \texttt{w}(\gamma_1)$ and $\mathcal{H}(\gamma_{\lfloor \texttt{k}}) = \mathcal{H}(\texttt{head}(\gamma_{\lfloor \texttt{k}})) \times \mathcal{H}(\texttt{tail}(\gamma_{\lfloor \texttt{k}}))$

For TAPDs and STAs we let $\mathcal{H}(\gamma_{\lfloor \texttt{k}}) = \int_{\bar{\texttt{c}} \in [0,1]^{\texttt{n}}} \prod_{\texttt{i}=1}^{\texttt{k}} \texttt{P}^{\texttt{s}}_{\texttt{s}'} d\bar{\texttt{c}}$ if $\gamma_{\texttt{i}} \in (\texttt{s}, \texttt{s}')$

Note that γ may identify many different transitions, hence identifying certain machine behaviour.

Proposition 2. *Let ϕ be a trace and let $\gamma = \Gamma(\phi)$ Then for any $\texttt{k}$, $\mathcal{H}(\gamma_{\lfloor \texttt{k}}) < 1$*

Proof sketch: Analogous to the argument in the proof of Proposition 1. □

For a collection of traces Φ', let $\mathcal{L}(\Phi') = \sum_{\phi \in \Phi'} \mathcal{H}(\phi)$

Proposition 3. *Let Φ be a prefix-free collection of traces of a given machine. For any subclass $\Phi' \subseteq \Phi$ we have $\mathcal{L}(\Phi') < 1$*

Proof sketch: □

Let ϕ, ϕ' be traces containing timing information. We consider them isomorphic and write $\phi \cong \phi'$ if there exist maps $\varepsilon\colon \texttt{T}(\phi) \to \texttt{T}(\phi')$ and $\vartheta\colon \Gamma(\phi) \to \Gamma(\phi')$ such that, for all $\texttt{k}$, ε is a time-isomorphism, ϑ is a relabelling and for all $\texttt{i} \leq \texttt{k}$

$$\varepsilon(\texttt{T}(\phi(\texttt{i}))) = \varepsilon(\texttt{T}(\phi'(\texttt{i}))) \text{ and } \vartheta(\Gamma(\phi(\texttt{i}))) = \vartheta(\Gamma(\phi'(\texttt{i})))$$

with $\mathcal{H}(\phi) = \mathcal{H}(\phi')$.

Alternatively, if one of ψ, ψ' does not contain timing information, we will only require the relabelling on actions: $\vartheta \colon \Gamma(\phi) \to \Gamma(\phi')$ such that, for all $\mathtt{k}$, and for all $\mathtt{i} \leq \mathtt{k}$

$$\vartheta(\Gamma(\phi(\mathtt{i}))) = \vartheta(\Gamma(\phi'(\mathtt{i}))) \text{ with } \mathcal{H}(\phi) = \mathcal{H}(\phi')$$

Definition 7 (Trace Expressiveness).

For two collections of traces Φ and Φ', let them be expressively isomorphic, $\Phi \cong \Phi'$, if there exists a bijection $\alpha \colon \Phi \to \Phi'$, relabelling ϑ and a time-isomorphism ε such that $\mathtt{T}(\phi) \xrightarrow{\varepsilon} \mathtt{T}(\alpha(\phi))$ and $\Gamma(\phi) \xrightarrow{\vartheta} \Gamma(\alpha(\phi))$, or if one of Φ, Φ' does not contain traces with timing information, $\Gamma(\phi) \xrightarrow{\vartheta} \Gamma(\alpha(\phi))$ as in Figure 3. We say machine M expresses machine M' and write $M \cong_{\mathtt{trace}} M'$ if $\Phi_M \cong \Phi_{M'}$ and for every $\hat{\Phi} \subset \Phi_M$, $\hat{\Phi}' \subset \Phi_{M'}$ if $\hat{\Phi} \cong \hat{\Phi}'$ then $\mathcal{L}(\hat{\Phi}) = \mathcal{L}(\hat{\Phi}')$. A collection of machines $\mathcal{S}$ expresses *a collection of machines $\mathcal{S}'$ and write $\mathcal{S}' \sqsubseteq_{\mathtt{trace}} \mathcal{S}$ if for every $M' \in \mathcal{S}'$ there exists $M \in \mathcal{S}$ such that $M \cong M'$. Write $\mathcal{S}' \sqsubset_{\mathtt{trace}} \mathcal{S}$ if the inclusion is strict and write $\mathcal{S}' =_{\mathtt{trace}} \mathcal{S}$ if $\mathcal{S}' \sqsubseteq_{\mathtt{trace}} \mathcal{S}$ and $\mathcal{S} \sqsubseteq_{\mathtt{trace}} \mathcal{S}'$*

Theorem 1. *We observe the following equalities and strict inclusions, depicted in Fig 2:*

- $\mathtt{NFA} =_{\mathtt{trace}} \mathtt{TIMED}$,
- $\mathtt{NFA} =_{\mathtt{trace}} \mathtt{PROB}$,
- $\mathtt{TIMED} =_{\mathtt{trace}} \mathtt{PROBTIMED}$,
- $\mathtt{PROB} =_{\mathtt{trace}} \mathtt{PROBTIMED}$,
- $\mathtt{PROBTIMED} \sqsubset_{\mathtt{trace}} \mathtt{DELAY}$,
- $\mathtt{DELAY} \sqsubset_{\mathtt{trace}} \mathtt{STOCTIMED}$.

The following is a sketch of the proof. The propositions in the appendix make up the proof of Theorem 1. Our results yield the inclusions depicted in Figure 2.

Proof sketch:

- For a given TA, an NFA can be constructed by suitably choosing the transition relation according to Alur and Dill's construction of the region automaton. Conversely, a TA can be constructed by ignoring timing information.
- Given a TA, an NFA can be constructed that expresses the PA by choosing appropriate weights for the edges. The converse argument is similar.
- Given a PA, an NFA can be constructed that expresses the PA by choosing appropriate weights for the edges. The converse argument is similar.
- Given a TA, a PTA can be constructed that expresses the TA by choosing appropriate weights for the edges. The converse argument is similar.
- Given a PA, a PTA can be constructed that expresses the PA by choosing appropriate weights for the edges. The converse argument is similar.
- For a given PTA it is possible to construct a TAPD that expresses the PTA. Intuitively, the edge probabilities are kept constant on the scaled time intervals. The inclusion is strict since a trace measure for a PTA is determined by a product of fixed weights while for a TAPD it is an integral of the sequence of edge functions.

- Functions described by polynomials are analytic and measurable. Polynomial terms are countable, hence there exist non-analytic measurable functions, so we have the following result.

□



Fig. 2. Trace Expressiveness

5 Conclusion

We presented here our results in [16] regarding isomorphic run expressiveness of timed and probabilistic automata. Well-defined measures can be assigned to runs of machines and we may also measure the collection of runs of a given machine. A run will then express another run if the states and actions of the first can be put into a one-to-one correspondence with the states and actions of the second and there exists a time-isomorphism between the time-stamps in the runs together with the condition that the two run measures are the same. A machine will express another machine if and only if there exists a bijection between their collection of runs such that the image under this bijection is expressed by its preimage and their collection of runs have the same measure.

We then introduced an analogous framework for understanding the expressiveness of timed and probabilistic automata in terms of traces, rather than runs. We defined similar measures on the traces of machines and understood two traces as *isomorphic* if one can be obtained from another by applying certain transformations: actions must be put in a one-to-one correspondence and a time-isomorphism must exist between the time-stamps of the traces. The analogous measure of trace isomorphism is thus determined.

We considered an automaton to be characterized by its set of traces and the expressiveness of a class of automata to be characterized by the traces of its machines and their distributions. Two machines will then have the same expressiveness power if there exists a bijection between their collection of traces determined by these isomorphisms.

The measure we placed on machine traces is sensitive to probabilities and gives an account of the trace distributions. Our previous results in [16] were also outlined here and observed a sharp separation in expressiveness between the models considered, which are the same formalisms considered in this paper, through isomorphic run-expressiveness. We observed in the present work a split between stochastic and non-stochastic models when using trace expressiveness.

A Trace Expressiveness

The following is a detailed proof of proposition 3.

Proof. **Claim:** for any pair of traces ϕ, ϕ' there exists a trace ϕ'' such that $\phi'' \preceq \phi$ and $\phi'' \preceq \phi'$. This is immediate since ϕ'' may be empty, and the claim induces a partial order on the traces of any machine, hence any collection of runs may be viewed as a finitely branching tree.

Claim: for any pair of traces ϕ, ϕ', if $\phi \preceq \phi'$ then $\mathcal{H}(\phi) \geq \mathcal{H}(\phi')$. This is provable by induction on the length of traces.

Let $\phi = (\#, \#, \#) \xrightarrow[\tau_1]{\gamma_1} (\#, \#, \#) \xrightarrow[\tau_2]{\gamma_2} \dots$ and consider any finite segment of this trace ϕ'. We have $\mathcal{H}(\phi) = \prod_{\mathtt{i}=1}^{|\phi|} \mathtt{w}(\phi(\mathtt{i}))$ and $\mathcal{H}(\phi') = \prod_{\mathtt{i}=1}^{|\phi'|} \mathtt{w}(\phi'(\mathtt{i}))$. Since $|\phi'| \leq |\phi|$ and each weight $\mathtt{w} < 1$ the claim follows.

We are now concerned with sums of the form $S_\mathtt{k} = \mathtt{x}_1 + \mathtt{x}_2 + \dots + \mathtt{x}_\mathtt{k}$ where $\mathtt{x}_\mathtt{i}$ represents the measure of trace $\phi_\mathtt{i}$.

From the first claim, this is $\mathcal{H}(\hat{\phi}) \times (\mathtt{x} + \mathtt{x}') \geq 1$ where $\mathtt{x} = \prod_{\mathtt{r}=|\hat{\phi}|}^{|\phi_\mathtt{k}|} \mathtt{w}(\phi_\mathtt{k}(\mathtt{r}))$ and $\mathtt{x}' = (\mathtt{x}_1 + \mathtt{x}_2 + \dots + \mathtt{x}_{\mathtt{k}-1})/\mathcal{H}(\hat{\phi})$ and by the first claim we may choose $\hat{\phi}$ to be the biggest common initial segment of $\phi_\mathtt{i}$ for $1 \leq \mathtt{i} \leq \mathtt{k}+1$. It suffices to show that $\mathtt{x} + \mathtt{x}' < 1$. We thus have

$$\mathtt{x} + \mathtt{x}' = \prod_{\mathtt{j}=|\hat{\phi}|}^{|\phi_1|} \mathtt{w}(\phi_1(\mathtt{j})) + \prod_{\mathtt{j}=|\hat{\phi}|}^{|\phi_2|} \mathtt{w}(\phi_2(\mathtt{j})) + \dots + \prod_{\mathtt{j}=|\hat{\phi}|}^{|\phi_{\mathtt{k}-1}|} \mathtt{w}(\phi_{\mathtt{k}-1}(\mathtt{j})) + \prod_{\mathtt{j}=|\hat{\phi}|}^{|\phi_\mathtt{k}|} \mathtt{w}(\phi_\mathtt{k}(\mathtt{j}))$$

and we may assume wlog $|\phi_1| = |\phi_2| = \dots = |\phi_{\mathtt{k}-1}| = |\phi_\mathtt{k}| = \mathtt{t}$ so we have

$$\mathtt{x} + \mathtt{x}' = \prod_{\mathtt{j}=|\hat{\phi}|}^{\mathtt{t}} \mathtt{w}(\phi_1(\mathtt{j})) + \prod_{\mathtt{j}=|\hat{\phi}|}^{\mathtt{t}} \mathtt{w}(\phi_2(\mathtt{j})) + \dots + \prod_{\mathtt{j}=|\hat{\phi}|}^{\mathtt{t}} \mathtt{w}(\phi_{\mathtt{k}-1}(\mathtt{j})) + \prod_{\mathtt{j}=|\hat{\phi}|}^{\mathtt{t}} \mathtt{w}(\phi_\mathtt{k}(\mathtt{j}))$$

We show by induction on $\mathtt{t}$ that $\mathtt{x} + \mathtt{x}' < 1$. If $\mathtt{t} = 1$ we have $\mathtt{w}(\phi_1(1)) + \mathtt{w}(\phi_2(1)) + \dots \mathtt{w}(\phi_\mathtt{k}(1)) < 1$ since for any edges $\mathtt{e}_{\psi_\mathtt{i}}(1)$ and $\mathtt{e}_{\psi_\mathtt{j}}(1)$ we must have $\mathtt{source}(\mathtt{e}_{\phi_\mathtt{i}}(1)) = \mathtt{source}(\mathtt{e}_{\phi_\mathtt{j}}(1))$. Suppose the statement holds for some $\mathtt{t}$ so we have

$$\prod_{\mathtt{j}=|\hat{\phi}|}^{\mathtt{t}} \mathtt{w}(\phi_1(\mathtt{j})) + \prod_{\mathtt{j}=|\hat{\phi}|}^{\mathtt{t}} \mathtt{w}(\phi_2(\mathtt{j})) + \dots + \prod_{\mathtt{j}=|\hat{\phi}|}^{\mathtt{t}} \mathtt{w}(\phi_{\mathtt{k}-1}(\mathtt{j})) + \prod_{\mathtt{j}=|\hat{\phi}|}^{\mathtt{t}} \mathtt{w}(\phi_\mathtt{k}(\mathtt{j})) < 1$$

consider the case of $\mathtt{t}+1$, which is:

$$\mathtt{w}(\phi_1(\mathtt{t}+1)) \prod_{\mathtt{j}=|\hat{\phi}|}^{\mathtt{t}} \mathtt{w}(\phi_1(\mathtt{j})) + \mathtt{w}(\phi_2(\mathtt{t}+1)) \prod_{\mathtt{j}=|\hat{\phi}|}^{\mathtt{t}} \mathtt{w}(\phi_2(\mathtt{j})) + \dots$$

$$+\mathtt{w}(\phi_{\mathtt{k}-1}(\mathtt{t}+1)) \prod_{\mathtt{j}=|\hat{\phi}|}^{\mathtt{t}} \mathtt{w}(\phi_{\mathtt{k}-1}(\mathtt{j})) + \mathtt{w}(\phi_\mathtt{k}(\mathtt{t}+1)) \prod_{\mathtt{j}=|\hat{\phi}|}^{\mathtt{t}} \mathtt{w}(\phi_\mathtt{k}(\mathtt{j}))$$

By the second claim each term in this sum of the form $\mathtt{w}(\phi_{\mathtt{r}}(\mathtt{t}{+}1)) \prod_{\mathtt{j}=|\hat{\phi}|}^{\mathtt{t}} \mathtt{w}(\phi_{\mathtt{r}}(\mathtt{j}))$ must be less than the term $\prod_{\mathtt{j}=|\hat{\phi}|}^{\mathtt{t}} \mathtt{w}(\phi_{\mathtt{r}}(\mathtt{j}))$, which proves the inductive step.

□

$$\Psi \xrightarrow{\varepsilon,\vartheta} \alpha(\Psi) \qquad \mathtt{T}(\Psi) \xrightarrow{\varepsilon} \mathtt{T}(\alpha(\Psi)) \qquad \Gamma(\Psi) \xrightarrow{\vartheta} \Gamma(\alpha(\Psi))$$

Fig. 3. Expressiveness Maps

Proposition 4. $\mathtt{NFA} =_{\mathtt{trace}} \mathtt{TIMED}$

Proof. A machine $\mathsf{N} \in \mathtt{NFA}$ is expressively isomorphic to a machine $\mathsf{T} \in \mathtt{TIMED}$ with

$$\mathsf{N} = (\mathtt{S}, \mathtt{s}_1, \Gamma, \delta) \text{ and } \mathsf{T} = (\mathtt{S}', \mathtt{s}_1{}', \Gamma, \mathtt{C}, \delta')$$

where $\mathtt{S}' = \mathtt{S}$, $\mathtt{s}_1{}' = \mathtt{s}_1$ and $(\mathtt{s}, \mathtt{R}, \mathtt{con}, \gamma, \mathtt{s}') \in \delta'$ if and only if $(\mathtt{s}, \gamma, \mathtt{s}') \in \delta$.

For the first direction, we may take such an $\mathsf{N} \in \mathtt{NFA}$ and consider the corresponding $\mathsf{T} \in \mathtt{TIMED}$ with $\mathtt{C} = \emptyset$.

For the other direction, we take $\mathsf{T} \in \mathtt{TIMED}$ and consider the corresponding region automaton $\mathsf{N} \in \mathtt{NFA}$ constructed as described in [1] let a trace of T be $\phi_{\mathsf{T}} = (\#, \#, \#) \xrightarrow[\tau_1]{\gamma_1} (\#, \#, \#) \xrightarrow[\tau_2]{\gamma_2} \ldots$ and by definition there exists an isomorphic trace ϕ' of N since $(\mathtt{s}, \mathtt{R}, \mathtt{con}, \gamma, \mathtt{s}') \in \delta'$ if and only if $(\mathtt{s}, \gamma, \mathtt{s}') \in \delta$. Also, $\mathcal{L}(\Phi) = \mathcal{L}(\Phi')$ since there exists a one-to-one correspondence between machine traces.

□

Proposition 5. $\mathtt{NFA} =_{\mathtt{trace}} \mathtt{PROB}$

Proof. A machine $\mathsf{N} \in \mathtt{NFA}$ is expressively isomorphic to a machine $\mathsf{P} \in \mathtt{PROB}$ with

$$\mathsf{N} = (\mathtt{S}, \mathtt{s}_1, \Gamma, \delta) \text{ and } \mathsf{P} = (\mathtt{S}', \mathtt{s}_1{}', \Gamma, \mathtt{prob})$$

such that $\mathtt{S}' = \mathtt{S}$, $\mathtt{s}_1{}' = \mathtt{s}_1$ and $(\mathtt{s}, \gamma, \mathtt{s}', \mathtt{distr}(\mathtt{s}, \mathtt{s}')) \in \mathtt{prob}$ if and only if $(\mathtt{s}, \gamma, \mathtt{s}') \in \delta$. For the first direction, we may take such an $\mathsf{N} \in \mathtt{NFA}$ and consider the corresponding $\mathsf{P} \in \mathtt{PROB}$ with $\sum_{\mathtt{s}'} \mathtt{distr}(\mathtt{s}, \mathtt{s}') = 1$ for any state $\mathtt{s}$.

To see the other direction, we take $\mathsf{P} \in \mathtt{PROB}$ and consider the corresponding $\mathsf{N} \in \mathtt{NFA}$ constructed as follows. We start with a source state $\mathtt{s}$ for which we add a corresponding state to the collection of states of N and we let $\mathtt{n} = GCD(\{\mathtt{distr}(\mathtt{s}, \mathtt{s}') \mid \mathtt{s} \in \mathtt{S}'\})$ and for any pair of states $\mathtt{s}, \mathtt{s}' \in \mathtt{S}'$ we add $\mathtt{n} \times \mathtt{distr}(\mathtt{s}, \mathtt{s}')$ many states $\mathtt{s}''$ to the set of states of N, with a transition between $\mathtt{s}$ and any such $\mathtt{s}''$. Let a trace of P be $\phi_{\mathsf{P}} = (\#, \#, \#) \xrightarrow[\tau_1]{\gamma_1} (\#, \#, \#) \xrightarrow[\tau_2]{\gamma_2} \ldots$ and by definition there exists an isomorphic trace of N since $(\mathtt{s}, \mathtt{R}, \mathtt{con}, \gamma, \mathtt{s}') \in \delta'$

if and only if $(\mathtt{s}, \gamma, \mathtt{s}') \in \delta$. Also, $\mathcal{L}(\Phi) = \mathcal{L}(\Phi')$ since the construction of N ensures there exists a one-to-one correspondence between machine traces.

□

Proposition 6. $\mathtt{TIMED} =_{\mathtt{trace}} \mathtt{PROBTIMED}$

Proof. Result follows from an argument similar to the proof of Proposition 5.

□

Proposition 7. $\mathtt{PROB} =_{\mathtt{trace}} \mathtt{PROBTIMED}$

Proof. Result follows from an argument similar to the proof of Proposition 4.

□

Proposition 8. $\mathtt{PROBTIMED} \sqsubset_{\mathtt{trace}} \mathtt{DELAY}$

Proof. Let $\mathsf{A} \in \mathtt{PROBTIMED}$ and construct $\mathsf{D} \in \mathtt{DELAY}$ with

$$\mathsf{A} = (\mathtt{S}, \mathtt{s}_1, \Gamma, \mathtt{C}, \mathtt{prob}) \text{ and } \mathsf{D} = (\mathtt{S}, \mathtt{s}_1, \Gamma, \mathtt{C}, \mathtt{F}, \Delta, \Pi)_{\mathsf{D}}$$

such that $\mathtt{S}_{\mathsf{D}} \cong_{\varphi} \mathtt{S}_{\mathsf{A}}$, $\Gamma_{\mathsf{D}} = \Gamma_{\mathsf{A}}$, $\mathtt{C}_{\mathsf{D}} \cong_{\alpha} \mathtt{C}_{\mathsf{A}}$ and for any edge $e \in \mathtt{prob}$ with $e = (s_{\mathtt{i}}, s_{\mathtt{j}}, \gamma^{\mathtt{i}}_{\mathtt{j}}, \mathtt{con}^{\mathtt{i}}_{\mathtt{j}}, \mathtt{R}^{\mathtt{i}}_{\mathtt{j}}, \mathtt{P}(s_{\mathtt{i}}, s_{\mathtt{j}}))$ let $\delta^{\mathtt{i}}_{\mathtt{j}} \in \Delta$ such that

$$\delta^{\mathtt{i}}_{\mathtt{j}}(\bar{\mathtt{c}}) = (\mathtt{P}(\varphi(s_{\mathtt{i}}), \varphi(s_{\mathtt{j}})), \alpha(\mathtt{R}^{\mathtt{i}}_{\mathtt{j}}), \gamma^{\mathtt{i}}_{\mathtt{j}}) \text{ and } \mathtt{dom}(\delta^{\mathtt{i}}_{\mathtt{j}}) = [b, a]^{|\mathtt{C}_{\mathsf{A}}|}$$

with $b_{\mathtt{k}} = \mu\{\iota(\mathtt{c}_{\mathtt{k}})/\hat{\iota}_{\mathtt{k}} \mid \iota(\mathtt{c}_{\mathtt{k}}) \rhd \mathtt{con}^{\mathtt{i}}_{\mathtt{j}}\}$ and $a_{\mathtt{k}} = \xi\{\iota(\mathtt{c}_{\mathtt{k}})/\hat{\iota}_{\mathtt{k}} \mid \iota(\mathtt{c}_{\mathtt{k}}) \rhd \mathtt{con}^{\mathtt{i}}_{\mathtt{j}}\}$ where $\hat{\iota}_{\mathtt{k}}$ is taken as $\hat{\iota}_{\mathtt{k}} = \mathtt{n} + 1$ if $\iota(\mathtt{c}_{\mathtt{k}})$ is less or equal than $\mathtt{n}$ where $\mathtt{n}$ is the highest constant appearing in the guards of clock $\mathtt{c}_{\mathtt{k}}$, and if $\iota(\mathtt{c}_{\mathtt{k}}) > \mathtt{n}$ we let $\hat{\iota}_{\mathtt{k}} = \mathtt{n} + 0.5$. This construction is inspired by the construction of the region automaton in [1] and for further details we refer the reader to that paper.

Now take ϕ_{A} with

$$(\#, \#, \#) \xrightarrow[\tau_0]{\gamma_0} (\#, \#, \#) \xrightarrow[\tau_1]{\gamma_1} (\#, \#, \#) \xrightarrow[\tau_2]{\gamma_2} \dots$$

and define ϕ_{D} with

$$(\#, \#, \#) \xrightarrow[\varepsilon(\tau_0)]{\gamma_0} (\#, \#, \#) \xrightarrow[\varepsilon(\tau_1)]{\gamma_1} (\varphi(\mathtt{s}_2), \iota_2) \xrightarrow[\varepsilon(\tau_2)]{\gamma_2} \dots$$

for identity map ε.

ε is a time-isomorphism, while it is not hard to see that $\tau_{\mathtt{i}} \in \mathtt{dom}(\delta^{\mathtt{i}}_{\mathtt{i}+1})$.

To understand the inclusion is strict, consider the fact that there exist irreducible polynomials over $\mathbb{Q}$, and take a TAPD with $\mathtt{S} = \{1, 2, 3\}$ and $p^1_2 = x + 1/2$, $p^1_3 = 1/2 - x$, $p^2_1 = x + 1/2$, $p^2_3 = 1/2 - x$, $p^3_1 = x + 1/2$, $p^3_2 = 1/2 - x$ and actions $\gamma^1_2 = \gamma_1$, $\gamma^1_3 = \gamma_2$, $\gamma^2_1 = \gamma_3$, $\gamma^2_3 = \gamma_4$, $\gamma^3_1 = \gamma_5$, $\gamma^3_2 = \gamma_6$.

The probability of obtaining a trace with $(\gamma_1\gamma_2)^{2\mathtt{k}}$ for arbitrarily big $\mathtt{k}$ is $\mathcal{H}((\gamma_1\gamma_2)^{2\mathtt{k}}) = \int_0^{1/2} \prod_{\mathtt{m}=1}^{\mathtt{k}} (x + 1/2)(1/2 - x)dx$

Suppose there exists an $\mathsf{A} \in \mathtt{PROBTIMED}$ that expresses this D. Consider all possible traces of this machine of the form $(\gamma_1\gamma_2)^{2\mathtt{k}}$. The weighting map $\mathtt{W}$

must assign rational values to γ_1 and γ_2, so let $\mathtt{w}(\gamma_1) = p$ and $\mathtt{w}(\gamma_2) = p'$. We take $\mathtt{k} = 1$ and observe in D $\mathcal{H}(\gamma_1\gamma_2) = \int_0^{1/2} (x + 1/2)(1/2 - x)dx = 1/12$ $\mathcal{H}((\gamma_1\gamma_2)^2) = \int_0^{1/2} (x + 1/2)^2(1/2 - x)^2 dx = 1/60$ and we have:

$$\mathcal{H}(\psi'_{\lfloor 2}) = (\mathtt{P} \times \mathtt{P}') \text{ and } \mathcal{H}(\psi'_{\lfloor 4}) = (\mathtt{P} \times \mathtt{P}')^2$$

hence:

$$(\mathtt{P} \times \mathtt{P}') = 1/12 \text{ and } (\mathtt{P} \times \mathtt{P}')^2 = 1/60 \text{ however } (1/12)^2 \neq 1/60$$

□

Proposition 9. $\mathtt{DELAY} \sqsubset_{\mathtt{trace}} \mathtt{STOCTIMED}$

Proof. The first direction is easy since a TAPD is a restriction of an STA. Let $\mathsf{D} \in \mathtt{DELAY}$ and construct $\mathsf{S} \in \mathtt{DELAY}$ with

$$\mathsf{D} = (\mathtt{S}, \mathtt{s}_1, \Gamma, \mathtt{C}, \mathtt{F}, \Delta, \Pi)_{\mathsf{D}} \text{ and } \mathsf{S} = (\mathtt{S}, \mathtt{s}_1, \Gamma, \mathtt{C}, \mathtt{F}, \Delta)_{\mathsf{S}}$$

such that $\mathtt{S}_{\mathsf{S}} = \mathtt{S}_{\mathsf{D}}, \mathtt{s}_{1\mathsf{S}} = \mathtt{s}_{1\mathsf{D}}, \Gamma_{\mathsf{S}} = \Gamma_{\mathsf{D}}, \mathtt{C}_{\mathsf{S}} = \mathtt{C}_{\mathsf{D}}, \mathtt{F}_{\mathsf{S}} = \mathtt{F}_{\mathsf{D}}$ with $\delta^{\mathtt{i}}_{\mathtt{j}\mathsf{S}} = \frac{|\mathtt{f}^{\mathtt{i}}_{\mathtt{j}\mathsf{D}}|}{\sum_{\mathtt{k}=1}^{\mathtt{m}} |\mathtt{f}^{\mathtt{i}}_{\mathtt{k}\mathsf{D}}|}$

Now consider an STA with transitions determined by the exponential function $\mathtt{e}$. This function does not admit a finite Taylor representation, it follows the machine cannot be expressed by a TAPD.

□

References

1. Rajeev Alur and David L. Dill, *A Theory of Timed Automata*, Theoretical Computer Science, 126, 183–235 1994.
2. Nicolas Basset and Eugene Asarin, *Thin and Thick Timed Regular Languages*, Formal Modeling and Analysis of Timed Systems: 9th International Conference, FORMATS 2011, Aalborg, Denmark, September 21-23, 2011. Proceedings 113–128, 2011.
3. Nathalie Bertrand and Patricia Bouyer and Thomas Brihaye and Quentin Menet and Christel Baier and Marcus Groesser and Marcin Jurdzinski, *Stochastic Timed Automata*, Logical Methods in Computer Science, Volume 10, Issue 4, 2014.
4. Patricia Bouyer and François Laroussinie and Pierre-Alain Reynier, *Diagonal constraints in timed automata: Forward analysis of timed systems*, International Conference on Formal Modeling and Analysis of Timed Systems, 112–126, 2005.
5. Geoffrey Grimmett and David Stirzaker, *Probability and random processes*, Oxford University Press, 2001.
6. Arnd Hartmanns, *Model-checking and simulation for Stochastic Timed Systems*, Formal Methods for Components and Objects: 9th International Symposium, FMCO 2010, Graz, Austria, November 29 - December 1, 2010. Revised Papers, 372–391, 2012.

7. Marta Kwiatkowska and Gethin Norman and Jeremy Sproston and Fuzhi Wang, *Symbolic model checking for Probabilistic Timed Automata*, Formal Techniques, Modelling and Analysis of Timed and Fault-Tolerant Systems: Joint International Conferences on Formal Modeling and Analysis of Timed Systmes, FORMATS 2004, and Formal Techniques in Real-Time and Fault -Tolerant Systems, FTRTFT 2004, Grenoble, France, September 22-24, 2004. Proceedings, 293–308, 2004.
8. Jan JMM Rutten and Marta Kwiatkowska and Gethin Norman and David Parker, *Mathematical techniques for analyzing concurrent and probabilistic systems*, American Mathematical Society, 2004.
9. Mariëlle Stoelinga, *An introduction to probabilistic automata*, Bulletin of the European Association for Theoretical Computer Science, 176–198, 2002.
10. Christel Baier and Bettina Engelen and Mila Majster-Cederbaum, *Deciding bisimilarity and similarity for probabilistic processes*, Journal of Computer and System Sciences, Volume 60, Number 1, 187–231, 2000.
11. Christel Baier and Marta Kwiatkowska, *On the verification of qualitative properties of probabilistic processes under fairness constraints*, Information Processing Letters, Vol. 66, Number 2, 71–79, 1998.
12. Christel Baier and Marta Kwiatkowska, *Model checking for a probabilistic branching time logic with fairness*, Distributed Computing, Vol. 11, Number 3, 125–155, 1998.
13. Danièle Beauquier, *On probabilistic timed automata*, Theoretical Computer Science, Vol. 292, Number 1, 65–84, 2003.
14. Patricia Bouyer and Thomas Brihaye and Pierre Carlier and Quentin Menet, *Compositional design of stochastic timed automata*, International Computer Science Symposium in Russia, 117–130, 2016.
15. Patricia Bouyer and Thomas Brihaye and Marcin Jurdzinski and Quentin Menet, *Almost-Sure Model-Checking of Reactive Timed Automata*, QEST, Vol. 12, 138–147, 2012.
16. Valentin Bura and Tim French and Mark Reynolds, *Timed Automata with Polynomial Delay and their Expressiveness*, arXiv preprint, 2017.
17. Noam Chomsky, *Three models for the description of language*, IEEE Transactions on information theory, Vol. 2, Number 3, 113–124, 1956.
18. Christian Eisentraut and Holger Hermanns and Lijun Zhang, *On probabilistic automata in continuous time*, Logic in Computer Science (LICS), 2010 25th Annual IEEE Symposium on, 342–351, 2010.
19. Marta Kwiatkowska and Gethin Norman and Jeremy Sproston, *Symbolic Computation of Maximal Probabilistic Reachability*, International Conference on Concurrency Theory, 169–183, 2001.
20. Daniel Lehmann and Michael O Rabin, *On the advantages of free choice: a symmetric and fully distributed solution to the dining philosophers problem*, Proceedings of the 8th ACM SIGPLAN-SIGACT symposium on Principles of programming languages, 133–138, 1981.
21. Michael O Rabin, *Probabilistic automata*, Information and control, Vol. 6, Number 3, 230–245, 1963.
22. Roberto Segala, *Modeling and verification of randomized distributed real-time systems*, PhD Thesis, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 1996.
23. Roberto Segala, *Testing probabilistic automata*, International Conference on Concurrency Theory, 299–314, 1996.
24. Roberto Segala and Nancy Lynch, *Probabilistic simulations for probabilistic processes*, Nordic Journal of Computing, Vol 2, Number 2, 250–273, 1995.